

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 and 20-23 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 13, and 14 are amended, and claim 19 is canceled. No new matter is introduced.

I. 35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6-14, 16, 17, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Webb (U.S. Patent No. 5,727,135). By this Amendment, claim 19 is canceled, rendering its rejection moot. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, independent claims 1 and 6 are amended to recite: "image processing apparatus comprising an acquisition component that communicates over a network with a device that is a server, which controls a plurality of processing devices including the image processing apparatus so that a series of processes are applied to document data by the processing devices, the acquisition component acquiring an instruction from the device, the instruction instructing the image processing apparatus to process the document data by performing a first process included in the series of processes and including setting information representing a setting of the first process." Also, independent method claims 13 and 14 are similarly amended. Webb does not teach such an apparatus or method.

Webb discloses a printing system that provides a user of a host computer 13 with access to a substantially *real-time, visual and functional replica of the operator panel of a selected printer* 16. See Abstract and Fig. 1 of Webb. The Office Action asserts that the printing function of a control panel in Webb is equivalent to a series of processes recited in claim 1; the printer 16 of Webb is equivalent to the device recited in claim 1; and the host computer 11 of Webb is equivalent to the image processing apparatus recited in claim 1. However, Webb merely discloses that the host computer 11 receives instructions from the printer 16 *in order to emulate a control panel of the printer 16*, where the document data would be processed by the printer 16, not by the host computer 11. Thus, in Webb, the

printer 16 (the alleged device) *does not* instruct the host computer 11 (the alleged image processing apparatus) *to process the document data by performing a process*. Therefore, Webb does not disclose the apparatuses of claims 1 and 6 or the methods of claims 13 and 14.

Webb does not anticipate claims 1, 6, 13, and 14. Claims 2-5, 7-12, 15-18, and 20-23 variously depend from claims 1 and 6 and, thus, also are not anticipated by Webb. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

The Office Actions rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Webb in view of Nakagiri (U.S. Patent No. 6,924,826); rejects claims 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Webb in view of Mochizuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,804,018); and rejects claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Webb in view of Beard (U.S. Patent No. 6,615,297). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With regard to independent claims 1, 6, 13, and 14, Applicants respectfully submit that Webb, Nakagiri, Mochizuki, and Beard, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the apparatuses of claims 1 and 6 or the methods of claims 13 and 14. For the reasons stated above, Webb fails to render obvious independent claims 1, 6, 13, and 14.

Nakagiri, Mochizuki and Beard do not cure the deficiencies of Webb. Nakagiri discloses a user interface that controls the editing of the printing-setting information; Mochizuki discloses a printer that is capable of resending print data without a need for the host to be conscious of the content of the print data on the printer side; and Beard discloses a method for manipulating peripheral device settings for a printer. However, these references are all silent regarding at least the above-described features of independent claims 1, 6, 13, and 14.

Claims 1, 6, 13, and 14 would not have been rendered obvious by Webb, Nakagiri, Mochizuki, and Beard. Claims 2-5, 7-12, 15-18, and 20-23 variously depend from claims 1

and 6 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by Webb, Nakagiri, Mochizuki, and Beard. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18 and 20-23 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Thomas J. Pardini
Registration No. 30,411

JAO:TJP/cfr

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: October 27, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--